

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 were previously pending in the application. New claims 12 and 13 have been added by this amendment. Support for new claims 12 and 13 are original claims 1-3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ishida et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,711,084 ("Ishida").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites a semiconductor device having N additive latency, where N is a natural number, and $(N/2)$ serially-connected flip-flops. "Additive latency" is described in the Specification, page 1, line 14, as "*artificially delaying data during a data write operation or a data read operation*". Fig. 3 shows the address buffer 300 having an additive latency of N (page 3, lines 12-13), with $(N/2)$ flip-flops (page 4, lines 1-3). As an example, Fig. 4 shows the case where additive latency is 2, and N=2 (page 4, lines 4-5).

Ishida does not, however, teach or disclose all of the limitations of claim 1. Ishida does not teach $(n/2)$ flip-flops for an additive latency of n, as in claim 1. Instead, Ishida shows n flip-flops connected in series (col.10, lines 25-26). Also, Ishida uses the variable "N" (col. 5, lines 4-5) to describe the size of a memory array. Thus the "N" of Ishida represents a vastly different entity than claim 1. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and inherently include all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach the limitations of the base claim much less the further embodiments of the dependent claim.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-3 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In this regard, new claims 12 and 13 have been added by this amendment. Claim 12 includes all of the limitations of claims 1 and 2. Claim 13 depends from claim 12 as claim 3 depends from claim 2. Therefore it is submitted that new claims 12 and 13 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-13 of the application as amended is solicited. No new matter has been added by this amendment. The prior art referred to but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not considered pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
503-222-3613

I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being transmitted to the U.S. Patent and
Trademark Office via facsimile number
703-872-9306, on January 25, 2005.

Li Mei Vermilya

Li Mei Vermilya

Docket No. 9898-303

Page 6 of 6

Application No. 10/668,140

PAGE 7/8 * RCVD AT 1/25/2005 2:55:27 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/3 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:5032744622 * DURATION (mm:ss):02:32